

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1430 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/648,329	08/27/2003	Sung-Ro Go	1293.1802	5351
21171 STAAS & HA	7590 01/02/200 LSEY LLP	EXAMINER		
SUITE 700		GIESY, ADAM		
WASHINGTO	ORK AVENUE, N.W. ON. DC 20005		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	. ,		2627	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/02/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/648,329		GO, SUNG-RO		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	ADAM R. GIESY	2627		

	ADAM R. GIESY	2627	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 10 December 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
 X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidav eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to			
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07().		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri- inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t			cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor		TE below);	
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet 		duoina or elemplifuina t	no incurso for
appeal; and/or	ler form for appear by materially re	ducing or simplifying t	ie issues ioi
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1	16 and 41.33(a)).		
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 	See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		II be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1-5.9.11 and 15-17. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under apper and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13. Other: See Continuation Sheet.			

Examiner, Art Unit 2627 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

/Adam R. Giesy/

/Thang V. Tran/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2627

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Newly amended and added claims raise new issues that would change the scope of the invention previously claimed and prosecuted and would require further consideration and search. Examiner notes that simply changing the phase 'a clock signal' to the clock signal' will change the scope of Claim 1 from the previous version of the claim wherein the clock signal can be interpreted as any clock signal generated by the clock signal generator.

Continuation of 13. Other: Examiner has considered the arguments posed by Applicant. Examiner asserts that the new claim language changes the scope of the claims and would require further consideration.

Furthermore, Applicants argue, on pages 4 and 5 of the Response mailed on 12/10/2008, that Bradford does not disclose generating a clock signal which is synchronized with a received signal. Examiner respectfully disagrees, Examiner notes in that Bradford discloses that the video signal which is output from the composite video signal generator (Fig. 3, element 44') contains the video and synch (which examiner is reading as a clocking signal) information (see oclumen 10, lines 34-21. Examiner asserts that the Composite Video Signal Source' Itself (Fig. 3, element 44) can be considered a clock generator when the claim language is interpreted with the broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the instant specification. Therefore, Examiner asserts that the claimed limitations are they the Bradford reference which clearly discloses producing a clock signal (read on by synch portion of the signal) which is synchronized with a data signal (read on by composite video Information).